

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Please delete Figure 12.

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This reply is in response to the Office Action dated June 14, 2007. Claims 20, 22, 24, 27-54, 56, 58-60, 62, 63, 73, 74, 76, 78, 81-106, 108, 110-112, 114-117, 158-161, and 166-304 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19, 64-72, and 120-157 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner for being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 20, 24, 27-34, 41-54, 56, 58-60, 62, 63, 74, 78, 81-86, 93-106, 108, 110-112, 114, 115, 117, 158-161, 205-207, 255-257, 274-304 stand rejected. Claims 22, 35-40, 73, 76, 87-92, 116, 166-173 and Figure 12 stand objected to.

Applicant has amended the claims to place the application in condition for allowance.

Entry of the foregoing amendment and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### Objection to Figure 12

Applicant has deleted Figure 12 and all reference to Figure 12 in the application.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 45-54 and 97-105 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner states that certain language is not supported. Applicant respectfully disagrees, however has cancelled claims 45-54 and 97-105. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 45-54, 60, 62, 112, 114, 205-207, 255-257, 300 and 301 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as the Examiner suggests that it is unclear whether or not the pressures and temperatures in the parent claim apply to the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Those claims, especially when read in light of the specification, are more than clear to one of ordinary skill in the art. As described in the specification, the pressures and temperatures recited in the base claims can be operated in any one or more of the reactors of a multiple reactor system. Paragraph [00164] states:

This invention relates to processes to polymerize olefins comprising contacting one or more olefins having at least three carbon atoms with a catalyst compound and an

activator at in a supercritical polymerization medium in a reactor. **One or more reactors in series or in parallel may be used in the present invention.** Catalyst compound and activator may be delivered as a solution or slurry, either separately to the reactor, activated in-line just prior to the reactor, or preactivated and pumped as an activated solution or slurry to the reactor. A preferred operation is two solutions activated in-line. Polymerizations are carried out in either single reactor operation, in which monomer, comonomers, catalyst/activator, scavenger, and optional modifiers are added continuously to a single reactor or in series reactor operation, in which the above components are added to each of two or more reactors connected in series. The catalyst components can be added to the first reactor in the series. The catalyst component may also be added to both reactors, with one component being added to first reaction and another component to other reactors.

When read in combination with statements like "The polymerization processes described herein operate well in autoclave and tubular reactors." ([0166])" and "tubular reactors are also well suited for use in this invention, preferably tubular reactors capable of operating up to about 350MPa." ([00167]) it is clear that multiple reactors can be used in series or in parallel and tubular and autoclave reactors can be used with "the polymerization processes of this invention." One of ordinary skill in the art reading the disclosure and the claims would not be confused. They would understand that the temperature and pressure limitations in the parent claims were for the loop reactor mentioned in the parent claim, and that the other reactors in the dependent claims would have their own reaction conditions which might or might not be above the cloud point. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Double Patenting

Claims 275-304 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 of copending USSN 11/433,889. Applicant respectfully disagrees, however herewith submits a terminal disclaimer over 11/433,889.

Claims 20, 24, 27-34, 41-49, 56, 59-60, 62, 63, 74, 78, 81-86, 93-101, 106, 108, 110-112, 114, 115, 117, 158-161, 274-276, 278, 280-287, 294-302 and 304 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 of copending USSN 11/510,871 (now granted as U.S. Patent No. 7,279,536 on October 9, 2007). Applicant respectfully disagrees, however herewith submits a terminal disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 7,279,536.

### Claim objections

Claims 22, 35-40, 73, 76, 87-92, 116, 166-173 stand objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 22, 35-40, 73, 76, 87-92, 116, 166-173 are all dependent on claim 20 or 74 either directly or indirectly. Applicant submits that in view of the terminal disclaimers submitted herewith, claims 20 and 74 are allowable and thus Claims 22, 35-40, 73, 76, 87-92, 116, 166-173 should be allowable without rewriting them in independent form.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 174-204, 208-254, and 258-273.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully solicits a notice of allowance. Applicant invites the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any issues outstanding which have not been addressed to the Examiner's satisfaction.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712.

Respectfully submitted,

October 15, 2007

Date

/Catherine L. Bell/

Catherine L. Bell

Registration No. 35,444

ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
281-834-5982  
281-834-2495-Facsimile